UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,123	08/21/2003	Richard D. Dettinger	ROC920030105US1	7110

46797 7590 07/18/2011

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER	
CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/18/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/645,123	DETTINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MELLISSA M. CHOJNACKI	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 April 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 18-21, 30-32, and 34-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *7 and 20* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6, 18-19, 21, 30-32 and 34-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on April 27, 2011, no claims are cancelled; claims 7 and 20 have been amended, and no new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-7, 18-21, 30-32 and 34-40 are still presently pending in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 7 and 20 are allowed, if rewritten in independent form or incorporated into the independent claims. Also, pending an updated search.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 18-19, 21, 30-32, and 34-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,956,593), in view of Scanlon et al. (U.S. Patent no. 7,668,798).

As to claim 1, Gupta et al. teaches a method ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42),*** comprising:

receiving a selection of a portion of a first query having a plurality of portions containing fields and query logic ***(See column 2, lines 24-53; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)*** [Paragraph 21 of the Specification for this application states that the "query portion" can be defined as the entire query which is what Gupta defines];

annotating the selected portion of the first query by operation of one or more computer processors and responsive to receiving, via interface ***(See column 2, lines 18-22, lines 24-53)***; (i) an annotation for the selected portion of the first query ***(see column 2, lines 24-53)*** and (ii) a request to annotate the selected portion of the first query ***(See column 2, lines 24-53; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***;

receiving a suggested substitution for the annotated portion of the first query ***(See column 2, lines 41-53, wherein the "suggested substitution" is read on the "pre-defined content" and "pre-defined association with a particular annotation sets"; also see column 12, lines 31-67; column 13, lines 1-10)***; and

storing, on a storage medium, the annotation and the suggested substitution with a reference to the annotated portion of the first query ***(See column 2, lines 41-53, wherein the "suggested substitution" is read on the "pre-defined content" and "pre-defined association with a particular annotation sets"; also see column 12, lines 31-67; column 13, lines 1-10)***, wherein the interface is configured to present the annotation in conjunction with the suggested substitution and to allow a user composing a second query to replace, in the second query, the annotated portion with the

suggested substitution ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***.

Gupta et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database.

Scanlon et al. teaches a system and method for accessing data in disparate information sources ***(See abstract),*** in which he teaches wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database ***(See column 3, lines 5-67, column 4, lines 1-2, wherein Scanlon discloses the retrieval of data (querying) from a physical repository (physical database) using queries against a metamodel (database abstraction model)).***

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Gupta et al., to include wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gupta et al., by the teachings of Scanlon et al. because wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database would provide a user with a response to the query request that is compatible with the information source and recognizable by the information source ***(See Scanlon et al., column 1, lines 40-59).***

As to claim 2, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches wherein the selected portion of the first query comprises one or more query conditions ***(See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***.

As to claim 3, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches wherein the selected portion of the first query comprises one or more instance values of data, where instance values are any particular value inputted in a field ***(See Gupta et al., column 7, lines 28-67; column 8, lines 1-13; column 12, lines 39-67; column 13, lines 1-10).***

As to claim 4, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches providing an interface for building the query by specifying first query portions ***(See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***; and wherein receiving an indication of the selected portion of the query comprises receiving a user selection of one or more first query portions specified, via the interface, for use in a query ***(See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***.

As to claims 5 and 19, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches providing an interface allowing a user composing a first query to create a suggested substitution for the selected portion of the first query ***(See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);*** wherein the

operations further comprise providing an interface allowing a user composing the first query to create the suggested substitution for the selected portion of the query ***(See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42).***

As to claim 6, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches wherein storing the annotation with a reference to the one or more portion of the first query comprises: decomposing the portion of the first query into one or more fragments; and storing the fragments with the annotation ***(See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42).***

As to claim 18, Gupta et al. teaches a computer-readable storage medium containing a program which, when executed by a processor ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***, performs operations comprising:

receiving a selection of a portion of a query having a plurality of portions ***(See column 2, lines 24-53; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);***

annotating the selected portion of the query responsive to receiving, via interface ***(See column 2, lines 18-22, lines 24-53)***; (i) an annotation for the selected portion of the query ***(see column 2, lines 24-53)*** and (ii) a request to annotate with the selected

portion of the query ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);*** and

receiving a suggested substitution for the annotated portion of the first query ***(See column 2, lines 41-53, wherein the "suggested substitution" is read on the "pre-defined content" and "pre-defined association with a particular annotation sets"; also see column 12, lines 31-67; column 13, lines 1-10)***; and

storing, on a storage medium, the annotation and the suggested substitution with a reference to the annotated portion of the first query ***(See column 2, lines 41-53, wherein the "suggested substitution" is read on the "pre-defined content" and "pre-defined association with a particular annotation sets"; also see column 12, lines 31-67; column 13, lines 1-10)***, wherein the interface is configured to present the annotation in conjunction with the suggested substitution and to allow a user composing a second query to replace, in the second query, the annotated portion with the suggested substitution ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***.

Gupta et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database.

Scanlon et al. teaches a system and method for accessing data in disparate information sources ***(See abstract),*** in which he teaches wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database ***(See column 3, lines 5-67, column 4, lines 1-2, wherein Scanlon discloses the***

retrieval of data (querying) from a physical repository (physical database) using queries against a metamodel (database abstraction model)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Gupta et al., to include wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gupta et al., by the teachings of Scanlon et al. because wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database would provide a user with a response to the query request that is compatible with the information source and recognizable by the information source ***(See Scanlon et al., column 1, lines 40-59).***

As to claim 21, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches wherein the operations further comprise: monitoring one or more query portions specified for use in a query ***(See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);***

searching for annotations associated with the one or more query portions ***(See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);***

receiving a suggested substitution for the annotated portion of the first query ***(See column 2, lines 41-53, wherein the "suggested substitution" is read on the***

"pre-defined content" and "pre-defined association with a particular annotation sets"; also see column 12, lines 31-67; column 13, lines 1-10); and

storing, on a storage medium, the annotation and the suggested substitution with a reference to the annotated portion of the first query ***(See column 2, lines 41-53, wherein the "suggested substitution" is read on the "pre-defined content" and "pre-defined association with a particular annotation sets"; also see column 12, lines 31-67; column 13, lines 1-10)***, wherein the interface is configured to present the annotation in conjunction with the suggested substitution and to allow a user composing a second query to replace, in the second query, the annotated portion with the suggested substitution ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***.

As to claim 30, Gupta et al. a computer implemented method ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42),*** comprising:

receiving a selection of the a portion of a query having a plurality of portions ***(column 2, lines 24-53; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);***

providing an interface allowing a user to create an annotation and request to annotate the selected portion of the query with the annotation ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);***

by operation of one or more computer processors and in response to receiving the annotation and the request, annotating the selected portion of the query with the annotation by storing, on a storage medium, the annotation with a reference to the selected portion of the query ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);***

receiving a suggested substitution for the annotated portion of the first query ***(See column 2, lines 41-53, wherein the "suggested substitution" is read on the "pre-defined content" and "pre-defined association with a particular annotation sets"; also see column 12, lines 31-67; column 13, lines 1-10)***; and

storing, on a storage medium, the annotation and the suggested substitution with a reference to the annotated portion of the first query ***(See column 2, lines 41-53, wherein the "suggested substitution" is read on the "pre-defined content" and "pre-defined association with a particular annotation sets"; also see column 12, lines 31-67; column 13, lines 1-10)***, wherein the interface is configured to present the annotation in conjunction with the suggested substitution and to allow a user composing a second query to replace, in the second query, the annotated portion with the suggested substitution ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***.

monitoring one or more query portions specified for use in the second query ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);***

searching for stored annotations associated with the one or more portion of the query ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42);*** and

outputting an indication of one or more annotations, if found, associated with the one or more portion of the query ***(See column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42).***

Gupta et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database.

Scanlon et al. teaches a system and method for accessing data in disparate information sources ***(See abstract),*** in which he teaches wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database ***(See column 3, lines 5-67, column 4, lines 1-2, wherein Scanlon discloses the retrieval of data (querying) from a physical repository (physical database) using queries against a metamodel (database abstraction model)).***

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Gupta et al., to include wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gupta et al., by the teachings of Scanlon et al. because wherein the query comprises an abstract query posed against a database abstraction model for a physical database would provide a user with a response to the

query request that is compatible with the information source and recognizable by the information source ***(See Scanlon et al., column 1, lines 40-59).***

As to claims 31, 36, and 40, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches wherein the query comprises a database query ***(See Gupta et al., column 3, lines 37-49; column 7, lines 5-26, wherein the media that is being query are stored on a database).***

As to claims 32, 37, and 41, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches wherein the selected portion of the query comprises at least one of a query condition ***(See Gupta et al., column 2, lines 43-47; column 12, lines 39-59; column 15, lines 34-45; column 16, lines 19-42)***, an instance value in the query condition, a specified result field, and a specified formatting of the result field.

As to claims 34, 38, and 41, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches wherein the database abstraction model defines a plurality of logical fields that each define: (i) a logical field name, (ii) an access method, and (iii) a location in the physical database for accessing respective data elements in the physical database ***(See Scanlon et al., column 7 lines 15-67; column 8, lines 1-41).***

As to claims 35, 39, and 42, Gupta et al. as modified, teaches wherein the access method is selected from at least two different access method types, wherein each different access method type defines a different manner of exposing specified data

retrieved from a physical data field ***(See Scanlon et al., column 2, lines 27-57; column 7 lines 15-67; column 8, lines 1-41).***

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on April 18, 2011, with respect to the rejected claims 1-6, 18-19, 21, 30-32, and 34-43 have been fully considered but they are not found to be persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "***Gupta does not disclose any interface that is configured to present the annotation in conjunction with the suggested substitution and that allows a user composing a second query to replace the annotated portion with the suggested substitution in the second query, as recited in the claims,***" the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Gupta discloses a user being able to select additional information to the annotation such as "pre-defined content, predefined association with a particular annotation sets", which are read on "suggestions" therefore, adding and replacing the annotation (See column 2, lines 43-53; column 12, lines 31-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 17, lines 52-65).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELLISSA M. CHOJNACKI whose telephone number is (571)272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

July 1, 2011
Mmc

/Charles Rones/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164